



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

MR. RICHARD HORTON-SMITH'S *Conditional Sentences in Greek and Latin* (Macmillan) is based on his *Outline of the Theory of Conditional Sentences in Greek and Latin*, published as long ago as 1859. The plan is to lay down a scheme of possible combinations, which scheme, of course, involves the assumption that the author's views as to the constituent parts of the hypothesis are correct, and then to arrange under these categories the various phenomena of the language. There must be a fair field and no favor, above all no tampering with MSS; and *εἰ ἴσθησι, εἰ στήσει, ἐὰν στήσῃ* must not be allowed to absorb our attention, to the exclusion of *εἰ ἐσθήξει ἂν, ἐὰν ἐσθῆκῃς ἂν εἴη* and *ἐὰν ἐσθήκει ἂν*. Now, with such a conception of the task, it is not in human nature to resist the temptation to fill out the scheme, and it requires deeper study than Mr. HORTON-SMITH has given the subject to appreciate fully the silences of language. For Mr. HORTON-SMITH, as we learn from his preface, has been withdrawn for a generation from the practice of teaching as well as from the currents of philological thought, and while he has amused himself with arranging under the different rubrics of his scheme a number of interesting examples, his processes seem strangely old-fashioned, now that everybody recognizes the limitations imposed by time, sphere, department, dialect. To be sure, such considerations as these are not altogether absent from Mr. HORTON-SMITH'S lucubrations, but his observations are sporadic and not systematic, and herein lies the characteristic difference between the syntax of to-day and the syntax of Mr. HORTON-SMITH'S beloved and revered teachers. Acute observers have never been lacking in the domain of Greek syntax, and it not unfrequently happens that the best thing has been said or implied in advance of modern formulation. Whoever gave the name *αἰτιατική* to the accusative thought more truly than most persons who have treated of the case since. Nay, before there was an *αἰτιατική* πᾶσις in grammar, Plato had meditated profoundly on the nature of the grammatical object, and in his *Euthyphron* gives the key to the periphrasis with the participle. Aristotle, to cite only one small matter, lays down the correct doctrine for the position of article, adjective and substantive, and Dionysios, however taught, appreciated more clearly than some modern commentators the significance of Thukydidean syntax. The same thing may be said of modern syntacticians from Gottfried Hermann down. But that is no good reason for keeping deliberately aloof from the paths that have been opened by recent research and for thanking one's stars that the law left leisure only for the kind of amusement that Mr. HORTON-SMITH has found in getting together the variegated contents of his bulky volume. For after all it would seem that the conditional sentence has merely

furnished a series of pegs from which to hang a number of literary game-bags, and the index reveals what we Americans would call in our mercantile way a 'job lot' of curiosities. Who would expect, for instance, in a treatise on the conditional sentence to be told of 'Adversity, its sweet uses,' 'Alfieri, his terseness,' 'Camoens, his poetic denunciation of naval enterprise,' 'Lord Chesterfield on proverbs,' and so on? Much of this extraneous matter is delightful, if one have a soul above grammar, but grammar is a severe study, and one is apt to be resentful when one contemplates seven hundred pages largely made up of what German scholars call *allogria*.

In a well-known passage of his *Poetisch-dialektische Syntax* (54, 3, 7), Krüger says that the frequency of the potential optative without *ἂν* is in inverse proportion to the excellence of the MSS. The better the MSS, the fewer the occurrences. This, he adds, is especially true of the minor orators; and so the recent editors of the minor orators, notably Blass, have very little scruple in restoring *ἂν* to such optatives. Of course, it is perfectly possible to take a diametrically opposite view, and to maintain that the authors that were most read were worst doctored. From this point of view the text of the minor orators may be regarded as a valuable museum of constructions that have escaped the processes of restoration such as have made the antiquities in some of our museums little better than forgeries. Such is or was the point of view of Herr Willibald Roeder, who some dozen years ago published sundry recalcitrancies against any change in the text of Isaios and against Cobet's changes in particular. Unquestionably, if you want 'sports,' you can always find them by looking into what prejudiced people will call poor texts. But a 'sport' remains a 'sport,' and isolated constructions cannot be made into a category without the most cogent reasons. If *δεῖ σ' ὅπως* occurred but once in Greek, a textual emendation might have suggested itself, but as there are three—all, to be sure, in dramatic poetry—we must try to get at the secret of the sudden shift from the expected infinitive to the *ὅπως* construction. So the combination of an anticipatory condition into a logical condition such as we find in Antiphon 6, 4 *ἂν τις κτείνῃ τινὰ ὃν αὐτὸς κρατεῖ καὶ μὴ ἔστιν ὁ τιμωρήσων* is perfectly explicable. *κρατεῖ* is too much for the normal *ῆ* which we find in a similar passage below (§5). An interesting irregularity occurs in the Timocratea, and what is still more interesting is the fact that the whole speech may be regarded as a protest against that irregularity. It is, as it were, a double *γραφὴ παρανόμων*, a protest against *ex post facto* law and at the same time a protest against *ex post facto* syntax. *εἰ τι τῶν ὀφειλόντων δεσμοῦ προστεῖμται ἢ τὸ λοιπὸν προστιμῆθῃ* (D. 24, 41) is therefore doubly bad. *οἶμαι*, says the orator (§72), *οὐδὲ ἐν' ἀνθρώπων ἄλλον τολμήσαι νόμον εἰσφέροντα ἐπὶ τῷ χρησθαι τοὺς πολίτας αὐτῷ τὰς κατὰ τοὺς πρότερον κυρίους νόμους κρίσεις γεγεννημένας ἐπιχειρῆσαι λύειν*. This, at all events, is an instructive sport. But in Hippocr. de Prisc. Med. I, p. 8 F = I, p. 20 K, *ὅπερ εἰ μὴ ἦν ἡτρικὴ ὅλως μὴδ' ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσκεπτο μὴδ' εὗροιτο μὴδέν*, it is simply absurd to keep *εὗροιτο*, which is not a passive and cannot mean 'were to have been discovered.' We must simply change *εὗροιτο* into *εὕρητο*, with Ermerins. It is an everyday case of itacism. Mr. HORTON-SMITH cites further (p. 49)

Eur. Or. 1132, but may it not be better to take *μεθεῖμεν*, with the scholiast, as aor. ind., and not as opt., with Goodwin (M. T. 508), or as 'subj. of the past,' with Mr. Horton-Smith? The unreal condition of an action that is decided, and so virtually past, is much more vigorous.¹ Comp. *νῦν δὲ* below. In Lys. 10, 9 *εἰ τίς σ' εἰποι πατραλοῖαν ἢ μητραλοῖαν, ἡξιόνης ἂν . . . ῶν ἂν* there is undoubtedly a shift, but it is just such a shift as one finds in illustrative hypotheses, hypotheses that are meant for arguments. So we find Isokr. 18, 57 *ὅμοιον ἐργαζόμενος ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ τῷ Φιννῶνδας πανουργίαν ὀνειδίσσειεν ἡ Φιλοργῶς ὁ τὸ Γοργόνειον ὑφελόμενος τοὺς ἄλλους ἱεροσύλους ἐφασκεν εἶναι*. In a long sentence cited from Plat. Alc. Pr. 111 E there is a shift from the ideal to the unreal—a *grata negligentia* of which we must not make too much by insisting on minute shades of difference; nor, on the other hand, are we to forsake so good a MS as the Clarkianus in Plat. Theaet., 147 A, in order to bring in a *difficilior lectio*. These are the comments that suggest themselves on one page of Mr. HORTON-SMITH, and there are many pages that might be annotated at the same length. So something might be said about *εἰ* with subj. *εἰ* w. subj. is an old generic form which survives here and there in dramatic poetry, for the most part as a bit of epic affectation to which the tragic poets were not superior. Wherever it shows itself in model prose it is more than suspicious. *ἐάν* has usurped its place, and that is all. To make a distinction between *εἰ* w. subj. and *ἐάν* w. subj., and translate the former *if haply* and the latter *if truly*, is futile. Mr. HORTON-SMITH wishes to have a Greek syntax that is good for all Greek. Now, is there any conceivable reason why we should never find *if truly* in all Pindar? Is it not, on the other hand, conceivable that the conservative poet should have stuck to the old formula just as he clung to the dying *ὄφρα*? In Theocr. 5, 64 *αἰ λῆς* is translated *if haply you shall be so desiring*, where *λῆς* seems to be clearly present indicative = *εἰ βούλει*. So 8, 85; 11, 56, whereas *αἰ κα λῆς* (5, 21) is *ἦν βούλη*. The future sense comes from the character of the verb. Of course, the Hippocratean corpus yields as many monsters as fabled Africa did of yore, and we are taught that there is a peculiar virtue in combining *ἦν* with a variety of indicatives which only need a slight change of accent to become normal subsj. But these specimens of Mr. HORTON-SMITH's method must suffice, showing as they do most clearly the utter hopelessness of reconciling his way of looking at things with the processes of recent grammatical thought which he has seen fit to ignore. There is a good deal of material which may serve by way of illustration, there are occasional *obiter dicta* which show native perspicacity. But the only men who can safely use the book will not take the trouble to explore the mass of irrelevancies for the sake of a happy turn here and a good remark there. A man who treats *εὐροίτο* as if it were *εὐρεθείη* puts himself out of court and cannot expect to have much weight attached to his undoubtedly just contention (p. 168) that *ἐάν* in Greek has no parallel construction in Latin, which better grammarians than Mr. HORTON-SMITH do not seem to have found out.

¹ See A. J. P. XIII 503.

Dr. HOLDEN's edition of *Plutarch's Life of Pericles* (Macmillan) is constructed on the lines of his other Plutarchean work with which every scholar is by this time familiar. In this volume, as in the others, there is no lack of instructive detail, and the young student can learn much besides Plutarch's Greek from the ample commentary and from the valuable indexes. Of course, where there is so much detail, there is always room for criticism of the petty sort. One misses a word about the avoidance of hiatus in *τοῖς ὅλοις*, c. IV 3, 35. It is impossible to take a thinker very seriously who shifts from singular to plural for the sake of euphony, and the *ταῖς ἀληθείαις* of Isokrates always calls up a smile at the expense of that rhetorical soul. *ταῖς ἀληθείαις*, so common in later Greek, occurs but once in the Demosthenean corpus, and then in XLIV, and Blass might have added this phrase to the rest of his objections to the speech which he belabors unmercifully. To be sure, the author is careless as to the hiatus in the body of the speech, but he is careful in the prooemium, and *ταῖς ἀληθείαις* is a cheap and familiar device. At c. VIII 4, 30 one wonders that an editor of Aristophanes should have disdained to quote Eq. 571 foll., and c. VIII 6, 48 might have had a note on *φῆσιν ὅτι*, that unmistakable sign of later date. C. XXXI 4, 31 *ἐνετίπωσε* is translated "cut in relief" or "intaglio," which is, to say the least, enigmatical, and it is quite too polite to translate *Ἀσπασία συνόντα*, c. XXIV 4, 33, 'by his marriage with Aspasia.' The Life of Plutarch which is prefixed to some of the other volumes is repeated here, and to this there will be no serious objection, but it would have been well either to substitute or to add some general characteristic of Plutarch's style. The students for whom these volumes were prepared are not sufficiently advanced to gather up the many items of the commentary into a literary portrait. True, the matter far outweighs the manner, but the philosophic *causeur* of Chaeronea introduces too many new-fangled words into Greek, and is a decided corrupter of youth, from the stylistic point of view.

The mention of Aspasia recalls a chapter in v. WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLEN-DORFF's *Aristoteles und Athen*—a work of manifold interest and incitement—in which he takes up the Aspasia legend with his wonted asperity (II 99). He protests, and not without reason, against making Perikles a Maecenas or a Lorenzo de' Medici, and as a part of his thesis he assails Aspasia in Aristophanic or rather Dikaiopolitan style. Aspasia, he maintains, was nothing more to Perikles than Herpyllis was to Aristotle. No decent woman in Athens could have been called Aspasia, and while the Ionians were not so particular, Aspasia was a favorite hetaira-name even among them, and the tradition that she had a father, Axiochos of Miletos, is offset by the other tradition that she was a Carian. Really this is abusing the proverb *ἐν Καρὶ κινδυνεύειν*. However, Wilamowitz, if ungallant, is interesting, and goes on to explain the origin of the Aspasia-myth. Aischines, the Sokratic, took it into his head to make what we should call a Ninon out of her, and idealized her so far as to represent respectable people as visiting at her house, among them Xenophon and his wife—a droll anachronism. Still, Xenophon was pleased at this compliment, and

returned it after the fashion of his time—and our time. In Mem. 2, 6, 36 Aspasia is represented as past mistress in the art of matrimonial negotiations, and in Oec. 3, 4 she is cited as a person experienced in managing an establishment—no excessive praise. This is the way in which the Egeria of Perikles was started, and, once started, she was taken up by the author of the Menexenos. Of course, Wilamowitz is incensed at the revived belief that the Menexenos was written by Plato, who was not the man to make a heroine out of an hetaira. "It is no small sign," he adds, "of the dignity of Attic history that only one female figure occurs in it—only one, but she dominates it throughout: The Virgin of the Acropolis." All this is sadly old-fashioned, but it may be mentioned that in the same chapter Wilamowitz draws a picture of Perikles which it is a pleasure to read after soiling one's self with the scandalous stuff that Plutarch has heaped up about the name of the great Athenian, to the effacement of his noble image. But the work of Perikles, W. insists, was the work of a great statesman, not of a universal genius. Parthenon and Propylaea, he contends, are no more evidence of his taste than the creations of Schinkel are evidences of the taste of Frederick William III, and all the rhetoric about the intimacy with Pheidias, the community of ideas between statesman and sculptor, is rubbish. Pheidias was and continued to be a *βάνανος* in the eyes of Perikles and men of his stamp. Such plain speaking helps to clear the philological air, even if some of us find the draught too strong, and close the windows hermetically with a shiver, as in a German lecture-room.

The fourth volume of FREEMAN'S *History of Sicily* (Macmillan & Co.) brings the narrative down to the death of Agathocles. The gaps in the MS have been filled by the insertion of passages from the author's small *Story of Sicily*, by copious footnotes, and by supplements placed at the end of the chapters they illustrate. All this is the work of Mr. FREEMAN'S faithful friend and devoted son-in-law, Mr. ARTHUR J. EVANS, whose utilization of recent numismatic discoveries adds a personal element and a special value to this labor of love.

Many of the emendations of the *Appendix Vergiliana* that have been published by Professor ROBINSON ELLIS in this Journal (see III 271-84, VIII 1-14, 399-414, XI 357, XV 469-94) have been accepted by PAPILLON and HAIGH in their beautiful pocket edition of all the works of *Vergil* (New York, Macmillan), a *lepidus novus libellus* which recalls Catullus and the editor of Catullus. The volume is a delight to the eye, the type is clear, and the paper that marvel of thinness and strength which is generally reserved for sacred literature of another school. The only fly in the ointment that I have noticed thus far is *fatī* for *fata* in the ominous words of Turnus, Aen. 9, 136-7: *sunt et mea contra | fata mihi*.

Those who have studied Professor BLASS's excellent little manual, *Hermeneutik und Kritik* (A. J. P. VII 274), must have been struck with the number of illustrations drawn from the New Testament. This would not be surprising in an English scholar, but in a German classical philologist of our day it is noteworthy, especially as Professor BLASS's tone towards the Greek of the N. T. is one of greater allowance than is common among professed students of Attic. The student of Attic, if he does not sympathize with the Emperor Julian in his sneer at the language of the Gospels, is prone to consider the Greek of the New Testament as a means of grace. It brings him down to the level of the common people who heard the Word with all readiness, and bids him associate with freedmen and other lightly esteemed persons, one Philologus among them, whose very names show their humble origin. But though such a lesson is of the greatest spiritual importance, it is better not to make phrases about it, and BLASS's method of treating the language of the N. T. is far the more excellent way. In his *Hermeneutik u. Kritik*², S. 199, he maintained that the writers of the N. T. handled imperfect and aorist, durative and complexive tenses with remarkable precision, and this *dictum*, coming from one who has made special studies in the imperfects and aorists of such a master as Demosthenes (A. J. P. XI 107), is not to be rejected lightly. Nor has he repented of his *dictum* in his *Editio philologica* of the *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht), a book which will doubtless give the editor all the trouble he anticipates from the theologians, but cannot fail to be warmly welcomed by men of his own guild. It is true that the chapter of the *Prolegomena* which deals with the language of the N. T. is somewhat disappointing. One craves much more. But the close observation of the peculiarities of the author of the Acts, and the perpetual comparison of the language with that of standard prose, make this edition one of unique practical importance. The student of classical Greek will come back to his special studies in Attic 'immunified' against post-classic microbes, and the theological student will gain a truer vision of the shades of culture in the early church.

After marshalling all the evidence obtainable about the *Pronunciation of the Greek Aspirates* (London, D. Nutt), Miss ELIZABETH A. S. DAWES, M. A., D. Lit. (Lond.), has arrived (pp. 102-3) at certain 'broad conclusions,' which in her judgment are not 'such as to justify a final decision in favour <of either> of the two opposed theories,' 'the aspiratic' and 'the spirantic.' The 'straddle,' to use an undignified Americanism, is somewhat disappointing.